Supermarket Selection by Singles in the Midwest

By
Dr. Ron Larson
Associate Professor, Haworth College of Business
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5430
ron.larson@wmich.edu

and

Kelley Steinhofer
Recent Haworth College of Business and Lee Honors College Graduate
Western Michigan University

Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Providence, Rhode Island, July 24-27, 2005

This research was partially supported by the Lee Honors College and by the Albertson's Company

Supermarket Selection by Singles in the Midwest

By Dr. Ron Larson and Kelley Steinhofer

Abstract

This study focused on the attributes singles aged 25 to 39 want in stores. Young single without children were mailed a survey about their supermarket attribute preferences and shopping and eating habits. Most of their preferences were similar to national averages. However, some common preconceptions were not supported.

Supermarket Selection by Singles in the Midwest

By Dr. Ron Larson and Kelley Steinhofer

Many supermarkets are stocking larger, "family-size" packages and using more multiple-purchase promotions as competition becomes more intense. Some consumers prefer the larger, "club packs" that were originally only available at warehouse stores (Nelson 2002; Turcsik 2004). Both tactics are believed to increase consumption and sales (Wansink 1996; Wansink Kent, and Hoch 1998). However, larger packages and multiple-purchase promotions may not appeal to an important and growing segment of the population: singles (e.g., Pressler 2003; Oldenburg 2004). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2004; 1995), the married population increased by 31.5 percent between 1970 and 2003. However, the unmarried population, aged 18 years and over, increased 133.4 percent during that same period. Older singles, including members of the "mature" or "Baby Boomer" generations, are fairly well understood by grocers because they have been selling them products for many years. However, younger singles, typically considered part of "Generation X," are often assumed to be different and to want new combinations of goods and services. Because the single population is expected to increase steadily over the next thirty years (Morrow, 2003), it is important for retailers to learn how to market to different subgroups within this important population segment.

Very little research currently exists on the market of young, single adult consumers. Of the articles that do exist, most either view singles as one distinct segment of the total population, compare them to other segments such as households with children, or differentiate them by the factors that have caused them to remain single. Because of the limited research in this area, many retailers are forced to guess about the shopping habits of young singles and about what products and services they want. Some of these preconceptions might include that young singles seldom cook and rely heavily on takeout or delivery, that they just buy a few items at the supermarket (i.e., small transaction sizes), that they shop many stores and have little store loyalty, that they prefer natural, organic, specialty gourmet and ethnic items, and that they do not use coupons or other promotional offers. This study focuses on young single adults within a defined age range, 25-39 years or "Generation X," who reside in one region and are currently without any children. By surveying young singles within a limited geographic area, this research will help identify any unique supermarket shopping preferences for this growing population segment and examine some common preconceptions.

Background

Traditional supermarkets have lost significant market share to new retail formats (e.g., supercenters, club stores, etc.). Between 1988 and 2003, their share of grocery and other consumable sales dropped from about 90 percent to about 56 percent (Moses 2005). The number of trips to grocery stores by the average household fell from 92 per year in 1995 to 69 per year in 2004 (Promo 2005). In response to this competition, many retailers have tried to differentiate themselves by adding new services and offering unique products. Larson (2003) suggested that the "drive for differentiation" is a major trend affecting the industry. Ratchford (2003) developed an index of the services offered by supermarkets. His index increased by 67 percent between 1981 and 1995. However, supermarkets must be careful with their use of differentiation. Manufacturers have learned that the addition of new features to products can reduce purchases by people who are not interested in those features (Simonson, Carmon and O'Curry 1994; Mukherjee and Hoyer 2001). If retailers add features that some customers do not appreciate (e.g., child care centers, cooking schools, etc.), these customers may shift more of their shopping to other stores. Because the profit margins are slim in the supermarket industry [net profit of under 1 percent during the last two years according to the Food Marketing Institute (2005)], most retailers strive to maintain high volume levels. They would prefer to use differentiation to attract a larger portion of some shoppers' spending without losing sales or shopping trips from other shoppers. Ultimately, the features that appeal to one group will hopefully not encourage others to shop elsewhere.

Many studies and surveys have looked at what the average consumer wants in a supermarket. Table 1 shows the results from Progressive Grocer surveys from the years 2000 to 2004 (Progressive Grocer 2002; Doyle 2003; Heller and McTaggart 2004; Heller and McTaggart 2005). There was considerable consistency in the attribute ratings. Other research has found that store attributes can affect a retailer's image (Hansen and Deutscher 1977-1978), that the type of promotions used can affect store preferences (Smith and Sinha 2000), and store attributes can affect patronage decisions (Arnold, Oum and Tigert 1983).

Unfortunately, average data could conceal important differences in what some segments of the population are interested in. There is considerable evidence that singles have different preferences and shopping behaviors. Unlike the average consumer population, singles are typically astute in what they are looking for, more food savvy, less price-sensitive, and more conscious of their personal tastes. They can afford to indulge more on themselves and tend to do so with specialty, high-priced goods. Singles may be less likely to stock-up on items when they shop and are often less likely to purchase large-sized items or high-impulse items (Lewandowsk, 2004). Young singles may not purchase as many high-impulse items on a specific shopping trip, but they are more likely to purchase a number of impulse items over the course of many shopping trips. One study on in-store consumer decision making found that 61.8 percent of purchases made by consumers less than 45 years old were unplanned compared to 56.2 percent for consumers 45 years and older (Inman and Winder 1998). The younger shoppers specifically planned only 27.2 percent of their total purchases compared to 32.9 percent of total purchases by older shoppers. A University of Alabama study on the shopping attitudes and behaviors of single versus multiple-person household shoppers (76 percent of the consumers surveyed were singles under 35 years old) found that these shoppers did not engage in pre-shopping planning activities such as scanning the newspapers ads or collecting coupons (Ezell and Russell 1985). Many singles are more pressed for time and more concerned with ease and quickness of shopping rather than saving money on their purchases.

According to Donthu and Gilliland (2002), singles tend to identify more closely with brand names. The lifestyle depicted by the brand may be a reflection of their own. By choosing a certain set of brands they may be assuring themselves of their lifestyle. When it comes to choosing a store brand or a national brand, singles do not consider the store brand as important and are more likely to purchase their favorite national brand regardless of the price (Lewandowski 2004). Singles are able to shop around different stores, if they so desire, for the exact flavors and sizes of products they want without having to cart kids in and out of stores or consult with a spouse before shopping. Despite the ability to shop more than one store, singles prefer to stick to stores that provide them with quick and convenient shopping. Many singles shop for groceries at off-peak hours and look for stores that accommodate their busy schedules, that are suitable for easy in-and-out shopping trips, and that provide easy, ready-to-eat meal solutions (Lewandowski 2004). Retailers can act on this opportunity by positioning and promoting their stores as places suitable for short trips with frequently purchased items at the front of the store and speedy checkouts (Veiders 2004). Since most singles live fast-paced and busy lives, they prefer these time-saving conveniences.

Besides looking at whether a person is single or married, another variable that may be important is a person's age. Joyce and Lambert (1996) found that age has an important influence on the perceptions of a store's image. Smith and Clurman (1997) popularized the generational system of classifying consumers based on their ages in the 1997 book, Rocking the Ages. They argued that each cohort group had different preferences than other generations and that these differences were likely to continue as they grew older. A person's experiences when they were young molds their interests and values. Since "Generation X" members had similar experiences in their youth, their preferences will continue to differ from the older "Baby Boomer" and "mature" generations. This segmentation model suggests that it is important to look at specific age groups to better understand their current and future purchase behaviors.

The generational model by Smith and Clurman (1997) has been criticized in two ways. First, some people argue that there are more than four cohorts or generational groups. Pontell preferred five groups and American Demographics used seven (Wellner 2000). Noble and Schewe (2003) used seven groupings but did not find strong support for their segmentation system. The other criticism with the generational model deals with the assumption that members of the generation will not change their purchase behaviors. The alternative life stage approach suggests that specific events (e.g., marriage, births of children, children leaving home, etc.) will generate large shifts in purchases (Kim 1990; Arndt 1979). This approach argues that if an individual is single, this lifestyle causes purchases and preferences to differ from those of individuals who are married and age has less influence on behaviors. It is likely the approach that works the best will vary by the type of different product or service under study. This research will shed some light on whether the generational model can help identify important differences in preferences for supermarket attributes.

Methodology

To learn about the preferences of young singles, a customized mailing list of 2000 names and addresses was purchased. The geography selected was the Northern half of Illinois and the Southern half of Michigan. By limiting the area covered, biases from variations in regional preferences were reduced. In Larson's (1998, 2004) analyses of regional food consumption patterns, this area tended to be in the same grouping. The geographic restriction also limited the variety of stores that consumers patronized. The list was also restricted to "Generation X" singles with no children. The survey was distributed in the Fall of 2004. Roughly 5 percent of the addresses were undeliverable and more than 270 usable responses were received (response rate of about 15 percent). About 46 responses were dropped from the analysis because they reported being married, 12 responses were dropped because they fell outside the 25-39 year-old age bracket, and 41 responses were dropped because children were present in the household (i.e., children might affect which store attributes appealed to shoppers). The remaining 178 responses were used in the analysis.

The survey instrument was patterned after national surveys on what attributes shoppers want in supermarkets (Table 1). These surveys asked shoppers to rate the importance of 45 store attributes. Most attributes in the national surveys were repeated in this survey and more than 20 new store attributes were added that might be of interest to young singles (Table 2). In addition, respondents were asked about 18 shopping and eating habits (Table 3). Respondents rated store attributes on a 7-point scale ("Very important" to "Not important at all") and rated the frequency of their shopping and eating habits on a 7-point scale ("Every shopping trip" or "Every day" to "Never"). They also were asked 17 demographic and shopping questions (e.g., education, time to reach primary store, average spending per shopping trip, etc.). By comparing the national survey with this young singles survey, it should be possible to identify differences in what singles want.

Results

At first glance, young singles seemed to desire many of the same attributes as the typical supermarket shopper (Table 4). Two of the top three attributes, "Cleanliness of store" (6.40 out of 7) and "Low prices" (6.37), were rated one and two in national surveys. The attribute rated lowest, "Video store/rental services" (1.98), was at the bottom of the national surveys. Several important differences were noted in bold in Table 4. "Convenient hours of operation" was ranked number one by singles. About 13 percent of respondents said their primary shopping trips were usually late at night or early in the morning. The national surveys had a similar attribute that rated thirty-second. Another difference was in the importance of "Debit/credit card acceptance." In the national surveys, this attribute ranked 21 out of 45 items. Young singles ranked it 4 out of 62 items. The highest ranked new (added) attributes in the singles survey were "Adequate lighting," ranked number 13, and "Visible and easy to read signs," ranked number 14. Although good lighting and clear signage are often emphasized as key attributes for appealing to "matures," they may also be important for supermarkets who are attempting to appeal to young singles.

Many of the added attributes were near the bottom of the rankings. "Photo developing services," "Coffee shops/drink stations," "Greeter at front entrance," "Food delivery services," "In-store restaurant/eating areas," and "Cooking schools" all received average scores below 3.0 from the 7-point scale. One might have expected that "Prepared food/meal solutions center" would get high marks from young singles. However, this attribute was ranked number 49 out of 62 (3.86 average on the 7-point scale). In the national surveys, “Sells fully prepared takeout meals” was ranked number 44 out of 45. Take-out food from supermarkets apparently is not considered an important offering by most respondents. Another preconception about singles is that they expect stores to carry demand natural, organic, gourmet, and ethnic foods. The gourmet/specialty food attribute was number 44, the ethnic food attribute was number 46, and the natural or organic food attribute was number 54 among the 62 store attributes.

Survey respondents were also asked about shopping and eating habits (Table 5). Two habits received an average score of at least 5 out of 7: “Stock up on items when you find a bargain” (5.05) and “Create a shopping list” (5.02). Both these habits appeared to be quite conventional and were ranked higher than “Buy in smaller, single-serving sizes” (4.31). This suggests that single-serving sizes may not be particularly important for most singles. “Use coupons retrieved from the internet” (2.30) had the lowest score among the 18 shopping or eating habit questions.

Singles may be more promotion-responsive than some might assume. Only 36 percent of the respondents said they did not redeem any discount coupons on a typical shopping trip. About 43.5 percent said they usually redeemed one to three coupons and 13.0 percent said they usually redeemed four to six coupons. Although “Frequent shopper program or savings club” was ranked number forty out of 62 attributes, this was not that different than the national survey findings (number thirty out of 45). Many retailers might expect singles to be particularly disinterested in these programs and not target promotional communications at them. Perhaps they would respond to the right promotional message. Nearly half of the respondents said their primary supermarket had a shopper loyalty or frequency reward program.

The demographic and shopping questions identified a few unique characteristics. More than half of the sample said they shopped at a supermarket three or fewer times per month. For supermarkets, 2.02 times per week is the national average (Heller and McTaggart 2005). When young singles shopped, the average amount they spent was well above the national average transaction size of $34. Nearly half the respondents said they spent at least $60 per shopping trip. Although they do not shop often, this high spending per trip may make young singles quite profitable for supermarkets. This also suggests that supermarkets may not be able to identify their single customers using transaction sizes.

Another question dealt with how long it took young singles to reach their primary supermarket (about 95 percent drove to reach the store). About 71 percent said it took them 10 minutes or less. "Convenient store location" was ranked number 6 out of 62 in the important store attributes section (and number 8 out of 45 in the national surveys). This suggests that young singles probably are not more willing than the typical consumer to travel far to shop at a different supermarket.

Because of the large number of store attribute and shopping and eating habit variables, factor analysis was used to reduce the data. Principle component analysis in SPSS 12.0 was used to form uncorrelated linear combinations of the 62 store attributes. It was also used to form factors out of the 18 shopping and habit variables. A varimax rotation helped simplify the interpretation of both sets of factors (SPSS 2004). Table 6 shows the 17 store attribute factors and 5 shopping and eating habit factors. These interpretations came from the rotated component matrices, Tables 7 and 8. The factors are listed across the top of these two tables.

These factors were the independent variables and overall store satisfaction was the dependent variable in linear regression. Gomez, McLaughlin, and Wittink (2004) found customer satisfaction to be closely associated with supermarket performance. This regression attempts to identify which attributes may be linked with higher store satisfaction. Only one factor was significant at the 5 percent confidence level in the linear regression model (Table 9). This factor appeared to represent some economizing behaviors because it was linked with buying store brands and larger package sizes. Young singles who said they regularly bought store brands and larger package sizes tended to be more satisfied with their primary store. Perhaps if supermarkets increased their store brand sampling events, they could introduce more young singles to store brands and boost their satisfaction. Not of the other factors were significantly linked with higher store satisfaction levels.

Conclusion

Overall, young singles may not want a significantly different mix of products and services in supermarkets. Most of the attributes they rated high were quite similar to what the average shopper wanted. Two highly-rated store features, convenient hours and debit/credit card acceptance, could be highlighted in targeted communications to "Generation X." Several other attributes desired by young singles, adequate lighting and easy-to-read signage, are probably also desired by mature customers, thus making them promising areas to explore and improve. Another opportunity, store brand promotions, is likely to appeal to many customer groups and not just young singles. In general, most stores probably would be better served by focusing on what their average customer is seeking and not trying to guess what attributes would attract more young singles to their stores. Many of the common assumptions about what young singles want are not supported in the data. Their supermarket preferences do not seem to be sufficiently unique, at least in the Midwest, to justify new capital expenditures or major marketing efforts.

Table 1. Rankings of Store Attributes from Progressive Grocer National Surveys, 2000-2004

Store Attribute	**2004 Rank**	**2003 Rank**	**2002 Rank**	**2001 Rank**	**2000 Rank**
Cleanliness	1	1	1	1	1
Low prices	2	2	2	3	3
Accurate price scanning	3	3	4	2	4
All prices clearly labeled	4	4	3	4	2
Accurate, pleasant checkout clerks	5	5	5	5	5
Freshness date marked on products	6	6	7	7	6
Good produce department	7	7	6	9	7
Convenient store location	8	8	8	6	11
Shelves usually well-stocked	9	9	9	8	10
Good layout for fast, easy shopping	10	10	11	13	15
Short wait for checkout	11	11	12	11	13
Frequent sales or specials	12	12	15	10	9
Good meat department	13	13	10	16	14
Helpful personnel in service departments	14	14	13	14	16
Doesn't run short of items on special	15	15	14	15	8
Unit pricing signs on shelves	16	16	16	12	12
Good dairy department	17	17	17	17	17
Able to do all your shopping in one store	18	18	18	18	20
New items I see advertised are available	19	19	20	19	18
Selection of low-priced store brand items	20	20	21	20	22
Store accepts credit or debit cards	21	21	19	25	28
Not usually overcrowded	22	22	22	21	24
Good frozen food department	23	23	23	22	19
Offers you double value coupons	24	24	25	24	23
Selection of nationally advertised brands	25	25	27	23	21
Manager is friendly and helpful	26	26	24	28	27
Pleasant atmosphere/decor	27	27	26	27	26
Baggers on duty	28	28	28	26	25
Good deli department	29	29	30	30	31
Store has a frequent shopper program	30	30	31	29	32
Availability of nutritional information	31	31	29	32	29
Open late hours	32	32	32	31	30
Has in-store bakery	33	33	33	33	33
Selection of generics (no brand name)	34	34	34	34	34
Environmentally friendly products	35	35	35	36	35
Assortment of non-food merchandise	36	36	37	35	37
Good drugs and toiletries section	37	37	36	37	36
Good fresh seafood	38	38	38	38	na
Check cashing service	39	39	39	39	38
Has a pharmacy	40	40	40	40	41
Good specialty/gourmet cheeses	41	41	41	42	na
Availability of natural/organic foods	42	42	43	41	39
Availability of ethnic foods	43	43	42	43	43
Sells fully prepared meals to take-out	44	44	44	44	44
Videotape rental	45	45	45	45	45

Table 2. Store Attributes Included in Survey of Young Singles

Store Attributes	Abbreviation	Store Attributes	Abbreviation
Ability to find products easily on the shelf	S1FinPro	In-store pharmacy	S32Pharm
Product availability (limited number of OOS)	S2Avail	Floral department	S33Flora
Store brands or private label selection	S3SBrand	Coffee shops/drink stations	S34Coffe
Gourmet/specialty foods selection	S4Gourm	Cooking schools	S35Cooki
Natural/organic foods selection	S5NatOrg	Video store/rental services	S36Video
Ethnic foods selection	S6Ethnic	Photo developing services	S37Photo
Wide variety of new products in each category	S7Variet	Frequent shopper program or savings club	S38Frequ
Wide variety of new items	S8NewItm	Debit/credit card acceptance	S39Credi
Freshness date marked on products	S9Fresh	ATMs/banks in the store	S40ATM
Nutritional Information about the product	S10Nutri	Food delivery services	S41Deliv
Cooking ideas/tips/recipes	S11CokID	Frequent sales or specials	S42Sales
Accurate shelf tags and price information	S12Tags	Food demonstrations/samples	S43Demos
Ease of moving around the store	S13Move	Security features in and outside of store	S44Secur
Wide aisles	S14WideA	Single-serving foods	S45SinSr
Visible and easy to read signs	S15Signs	Low prices	S46LPric
Commodities easily accessible	S16Comm	Coupons available in the store	S47Coups
Ease of comparing products on the shelf	S17Compr	Convenient store location	S48Conve
One-stop shopping capabilities	S18OneSt	Pleasant aromas inside store	S49Aroma
Store not usually overcrowded	S19Crowd	Convenient hours of operation	S50Hours
Grocery cart/basket availability	S20Cart	Store manager on duty	S51Manag
Close and ample parking	S21Park	Friendly, knowledgeable employees	S52Emplo
Prepared food/meal solutions center	S22Meals	Pleasant store atmosphere/decor	S53Atmos
Fast cashier check-out	S23Check	Cleanliness of store	S54Clean
Self-scanning check-out	S24Self	Adequate lighting throughout store	S55Light
Baggers on duty	S25Bagg	Pleasant background music	S56Music
Greeter at front entrance	S26Greet	Good dairy department	S57Dairy
Full-service deli	S27Deli	Full-service butcher/meat department	S58SMeat
Alcohol section	S28Alcoh	Good frozen food department	S59Frozn
Price scanning accuracy	S29PScan	Fresh seafood department/sushi bar	S60SeaFd
Bulk foods section	S30Bulk	Good produce department	S61Produ
In-store restaurants/eating areas	S31Restr	Fresh meat	S62FMeat

Table 3. Shopping and Eating Habit Attributes Used in Young Singles Survey

Shopping and Eating Habit Attributes	Abbreviation
Stock up on items when you find a bargain	H1Barga
Buy store brands instead of national brands	H2SBran
Use in-store coupons or weekly ad coupons	H3SCoup
Use coupons received in the mail	H4MCoup
Use coupons retrieved from internet	H5ICoup
Buy products because they are on sale	H6Sale
Use mail-in rebates for cash refunds	H7Rebat
Buy in larger package sizes	H8LSizes
Buy in smaller, single-serving sizes	H9SSizes
Create a shopping list before going grocery stopping	H10List
Buy only what's on your shopping list	H11BList
Go to stores other than primary grocery store for specials/sale items	H12OStor
Participate in store loyalty, frequent shopper, or savings club programs	H13Loyal
Dine out at full-service restaurants	H14Rest
Eat out at fast food establishments	H15FFood
Eat take-out or home delivery meals at home	H16TakO
Eat ready-made meals bought from the grocery store	H17RMeal
Eat home-cooked meals at home	H18HMeal

Table 4. Ranking of Store Attributes from Young Singles Survey

Store Attribute	Rank	Survey Ranking 7 to 1 Scale
Convenient hours of operation	**1**	**6.40**
Cleanliness of store	2	6.40
Low prices	3	6.37
Debit/credit card acceptance	**4**	**6.32**
Accurate shelf tags and price information	5	6.29
Convenient store location	6	6.28
Price scanning accuracy	7	6.24
Good produce department	8	6.21
Fast cashier check-out	9	6.18
Freshness date marked on products	10	6.10
Ease of moving around the store	11	6.08
Product availability (limited number of out-of-stocks)	12	6.07
Adequate lighting throughout store	**13**	**6.03**
Visible and easy to read signs	**14**	**5.98**
Friendly, knowledgeable employees	15	5.98
Fresh meat	16	5.97
Ability to find products easily on the shelf	17	5.91
Good dairy department	18	5.91
One-stop shopping capabilities	19	5.89
Frequent sales or specials	20	5.89
Wide aisles	21	5.83
Store not usually overcrowded	22	5.69
Pleasant store atmosphere/decor	23	5.62
Grocery cart/basket availability	24	5.60
Good frozen food department	25	5.59
Commodities easily accessible (e.g., bread and milk)	26	5.50
Ease of comparing products on the shelf	27	5.42
Close and ample parking	28	5.38
Nutritional information about the product	29	5.38
Wide variety of new products in each category	30	5.37
Coupons available in the store	31	5.27
Full-service butcher/meat department	32	5.26
Pleasant aromas inside store	33	5.11
Full-service deli	34	4.88
Security features in and outside of store	35	4.86
Wide variety of new items	36	4.76
Baggers on duty	37	4.55
Single-serving foods	38	4.55
Store brands or private label selection	39	4.51
Frequent shopper program or savings club	40	4.47

Table 4. Ranking of Store Attributes from Young Singles Survey, Continued

Store Attribute	Rank	Survey Ranking 7 to 1 Scale
Store manager on duty	41	4.46
Self-scanning check-out	42	4.44
ATMs/banks in the store	43	4.42
Gourmet/specialty foods selection	44	4.17
Alcohol section	45	4.11
Ethnic foods selection	46	4.08
Fresh seafood department/sushi bar	47	4.07
Pleasant background music	48	4.01
Prepared food/meal solutions center	49	3.86
Bulk foods section	50	3.79
Cooking ideas/tips/recipes	51	3.75
Food demonstrations/samples	52	3.68
Natural or organic foods selection	53	3.40
In-store pharmacy	54	3.35
Floral department	55	3.25
Photo developing services	56	2.79
Coffee shops/drink stations	57	2.73
Greeter at front entrance	58	2.55
Food delivery services	59	2.28
In-store restaurants/eating areas	60	2.27
Cooking schools	61	2.13
Video store/rental services	62	1.98

Table 5. Ranking of Shopping and Eating Habits from Young Singles Survey

Shopping and Eating Habits	**Rank**	**Survey Ranking 7 to 1 Scale**
Stock up on items when you find a bargain	1	5.05
Create a shopping list before going grocery shopping	2	5.02
Eat home-cooked meals at home	3	4.99
Participate in store loyalty, frequent shopper, or savings club programs	4	4.75
Buy store brands instead of national brands	5	4.53
Use in-store coupons or weekly ad coupons	6	4.42
Buy in smaller, single-serving sizes	7	4.31
Go to stores other than primary grocery store for specials/sale items	8	4.24
Buy products just because they are on sale	9	4.13
Buy in larger package sizes	10	3.96
Use coupons received in the mail	11	3.93
Dine out at full-service restaurants	12	3.93
Eat out at fast food establishments	13	3.79
Eat take-out or home delivery meals at home	14	3.70
Buy only what's on your shopping list	15	3.66
Eat ready-made meals bought from the grocery store	16	3.36
Use mail-in rebates for cash refunds	17	3.19
Use coupons retrieved from internet	18	2.30

Table 6. Factor Analysis Results

Store Attributes

- Factor 1 Extra Services (Video store, Cooking schools, In-store restaurant, Coffee shop)
- Factor 2 Store Atmosphere (Friendly, knowledgeable employees, Adequate Lighting, Pleasant atmosphere, Cleanliness of store)
- Factor 3 Price Accuracy (Accurate shelf tags, Price scanning accuracy)
- Factor 4 Fast Shopping (Ease of moving around the store, Wide Aisles)
- Factor 5 Meat Department (Full service butcher, Fresh meat)
- Factor 6 Niche Products (Natural/organic foods, Gourmet/specialty foods, Ethnic foods)
- Factor 7 Promotions (Frequent sales or specials, Frequent shopper program)
- Factor 8 Label Information (Freshness date marked on products, Nutritional information)
- Factor 9 Convenience (Convenient store location, ATMs/banks in the store)
- Factor 10 Meal Components (Alcohol section, Prepared food, Single-serving foods)
- Factor 11 Variety (Wide variety of products, Wide variety of new items)
- Factor 12 Crowding (Store not usually crowded, Grocery cart/basket availability)
- Factor 13 Drug Store (Photo developing services, In-store pharmacy)
- Factor 14 One Stop (One-stop shopping capabilities, Ability to find products easily)
- Factor 15 Payment (Debit/credit card acceptance)
- Factor 16 Checkout (Self-scanning check-out, Fast cashier checkout)
- Factor 17 Private Label (Store brand selection)

Shopping and Eating Habits

- Factor 1 Promotionally Responsive (Use coupons receive in the mail, Use instore coupons, Use coupons retrieved from the internet, Use mail-in rebates)
- Factor 2 Shopping List (Buy only what's on shopping list, Create a shopping list)
- Factor 3 Foodservice (Eat out at fast food establishments, Eat take-out or home delivery, Dine out at full service restaurants)
- Factor 4 Economizing (Buy store brands, Buy in larger package sizes)
- Factor 5 Quick Meals (Buy in smaller, single-serving sizes, Eat ready-made meals bought from the grocery store)

Table 7. Rotated Component Matrix for Store Attributes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
S1FinPro	-.007	.180	.003	.502	.102	.116	.158	.164	-.011	-.029	.209	-.050	.084	.439	.153	-.017	-.167
S2Avail	-.080	.068	.110	.497	.041	.176	.034	.376	.040	-.006	.325	-.210	-.002	.086	.109	-.143	-.052
S3SBrand	.081	-.024	.140	.071	.078	.081	.163	.040	-.069	.237	.068	.211	.005	.112	-.136	-.031	.688
S4Gourm	.079	.120	-.027	.010	.121	.795	-.090	-.010	-.075	.231	.046	-.103	.057	-.084	.075	.027	.034
S5NatOrg	.165	.038	.020	-.140	-.103	.806	.024	.101	.036	.019	.060	.105	-.013	.012	-.020	-.003	-.027
S6Ethnic	.117	.088	-.021	.046	.010	.784	-.005	-.023	.208	-.167	.192	.012	.053	.005	-.032	.006	.062
S7Variet	.079	.088	.143	.123	.166	.163	.163	.201	.001	-.154	.761	-.011	.095	.074	-.050	.003	.097
S8NewItm	.265	.072	.091	.090	.018	.160	.075	-.067	.190	.088	.728	.097	-.067	-.095	.190	-.083	-.061
S9Fresh	.105	.249	.312	.158	.097	.013	.098	.714	-.070	.013	.118	-.038	.037	.147	.038	.151	.054
S10Nutri	.199	.161	.188	.137	-.164	.124	.116	.583	.270	.217	.143	-.009	-.017	.064	-.213	.143	-.080
S11CokID	.403	.044	.119	.262	.150	.360	.197	.042	.104	.149	.302	.176	-.120	.008	.074	.139	.104
S12Tags	.003	.181	.761	.147	.037	.009	.176	.091	.046	.021	.132	-.031	.026	.132	.016	.077	.109
S13Move	.129	.144	.053	.868	-.119	-.064	.060	.040	.028	.091	-.044	.094	.010	.080	.011	-.012	.007
S14WideA	.145	.165	.142	.815	.065	-.107	.087	-.016	.033	.011	.090	.154	.092	.052	-.112	.085	.032
S15Signs	.014	.211	.321	.668	.214	.006	.034	.144	.174	-.058	.068	.084	.008	-.011	-.029	.042	.227
S16Comm	.069	.335	.308	.276	.244	-.100	.120	.405	.162	-.001	-.033	.071	-.139	.095	.082	-.055	.299
S17Compr	.156	.246	.592	.115	-.002	.129	.095	.022	.227	-.013	-.069	.091	-.145	.295	.045	-.143	.194
S18OneSt	.144	-.089	.293	.179	-.037	-.171	-.027	.068	-.014	-.022	-.041	.166	.096	.658	-.002	.062	.138
S19Crowd	-.058	.041	.001	.104	.047	.020	-.048	-.017	.051	.031	.013	.822	.070	.030	.132	.149	.152
S20Cart	.039	.156	.287	.225	.116	.133	.202	.068	.001	.003	.143	.546	-.105	.342	-.134	.021	-.117
S21Park	-.048	.444	-.037	.124	.097	-.106	.038	.159	-.046	.345	-.118	.136	.178	.269	.047	.237	.286
S22Meals	.315	.313	.040	.118	.246	.037	-.041	.120	-.137	.584	.051	.009	-.144	-.010	.164	.086	.006
S23Check	.052	.235	.078	.095	.035	-.057	.048	.178	.313	.191	-.121	.233	.130	.228	-.010	.565	.002
S24Self	.160	-.032	.063	-.015	.067	.070	.217	.038	-.054	-.090	-.006	.067	.010	-.040	.133	.747	.000
S25Bagg	.274	.043	.014	-.010	.190	.021	.168	.187	-.109	.308	.049	.308	.120	.189	.173	-.117	-.467
S26Greet	.554	.090	.069	.115	.208	-.030	.149	.097	.027	-.001	-.164	.108	.054	.127	.163	-.147	.013
S27Deli	.155	.130	.086	.026	.639	.076	.028	.012	.011	.397	.153	.035	.030	-.094	.071	.121	-.015
S28Alcoh	.132	.049	.054	-.089	.221	.139	.044	-.105	.017	.642	-.129	-.039	.248	-.044	-.031	-.055	.079
S29PScan	-.035	.187	.708	.064	.039	.008	.214	.168	-.022	.122	.000	.035	.111	-.066	.020	.176	-.127
S30Bulk	.402	.173	.304	.084	-.017	.074	.288	.039	.040	.138	-.023	.261	.343	-.213	-.146	-.038	.064
S31Restr	.724	.096	.027	.054	.046	-.091	.036	.011	.006	.169	.222	.035	.046	.155	-.044	.043	.011
S32Pharm	.430	.049	.050	.035	.017	.032	.009	-.054	.231	.023	.213	-.025	.551	.185	.137	.080	.109

Table 7. Rotated Component Matrix for Store Attributes, Continued

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
S33Flora	.483	.171	-.028	.112	.170	.047	.004	.105	-.071	.095	.051	-.133	.392	.112	.261	.089	-.043
S34Coffe	.711	.087	-.109	.046	-.040	.106	-.055	.119	-.022	.163	.013	-.095	.160	.107	-.094	.217	.106
S35Cooki	.776	.109	-.007	.013	-.001	.236	-.001	-.035	-.030	.016	.137	-.016	-.165	-.096	-.017	.035	-.136
S36Video	.784	-.045	.046	.089	.196	.129	-.022	.068	-.047	-.027	.019	.053	.182	-.023	.000	.106	.024
S37Photo	.406	.084	.036	.124	.208	.041	.101	-.067	.094	.081	-.110	.118	.611	-.006	.054	.050	-.135
S38Frequ	.166	.171	.152	-.101	.089	-.018	.611	.289	-.123	-.040	.086	-.064	.092	-.088	.305	.066	.021
S39Credi	-.036	.021	.083	-.048	-.036	.002	.078	-.009	.197	.047	.086	.079	.110	.023	.782	.118	-.117
S40ATM	.346	-.018	.053	.004	.052	-.017	.184	.037	.571	.204	.202	-.180	.094	-.067	.152	.120	.165
S41Deliv	.643	.029	.110	-.143	.183	.161	.186	.013	.220	.123	-.011	-.131	.100	-.154	-.075	-.138	.024
S42Sales	-.114	.180	.109	.147	.094	-.029	.736	.149	.081	.063	.227	.076	.040	.227	-.052	.068	-.021
S43Demos	.340	.146	.190	.081	.096	.179	.547	-.217	.182	.142	-.005	-.022	.085	-.042	.138	.066	.036
S44Secur	.321	.374	.207	.096	.078	-.026	.304	.016	.250	.224	-.155	.017	-.156	.265	-.111	-.043	-.007
S45SinSr	.306	.155	.299	.123	.082	-.077	.036	.253	.043	.539	.055	.139	-.103	.041	.013	-.083	.126
S46LPric	-.037	-.014	.396	.214	.135	-.122	.578	-.009	.254	-.073	-.023	.039	.099	.001	-.088	.241	.100
S47Coups	.199	.159	.241	.096	.142	-.025	.594	.102	.385	-.040	.083	.007	-.145	-.089	.065	.138	.141
S48Conve	-.050	.100	.085	.163	.047	.183	.124	.017	.665	-.210	-.015	.128	.047	-.059	.200	-.014	-.056
S49Aroma	.049	.437	-.071	.152	-.016	.225	.281	-.020	.275	.164	.127	.088	-.119	.043	.378	.037	-.148
S50Hours	-.150	.311	.127	-.012	.091	.171	.133	.147	.527	.032	.238	.035	.194	.218	-.006	-.056	-.168
S51Manag	.111	.686	-.012	.183	.196	.023	.252	.064	-.011	.043	-.069	-.002	.021	.105	.055	-.063	.199
S52Emplo	.056	.786	.115	.066	.035	.143	.099	.077	.112	-.017	.093	.117	.222	-.034	.129	-.115	.063
S53Atmos	.147	.725	.283	.158	.007	.054	.007	-.090	-.010	.144	.053	-.029	.088	.046	.067	-.037	-.084
S54Clean	.006	.702	.177	.033	.036	.120	.061	.318	.061	.091	.121	.029	.081	-.104	-.110	.079	-.086
S55Light	.022	.734	.105	.076	.087	.009	.026	.253	.146	.043	.097	.040	-.118	-.134	-.085	.132	-.078
S56Music	.298	.561	.120	.227	.140	.088	.071	-.159	-.056	.000	-.086	-.083	-.178	.266	.025	.205	-.051
S57Dairy	.203	.368	.255	.016	.314	.114	.025	.413	-.006	-.054	-.090	.177	-.186	-.071	.320	-.085	.137
S58SMeat	.197	.089	.045	.010	.851	.017	.174	-.034	.021	.108	-.007	.049	.031	.055	-.048	-.071	-.054
S59Frozn	.052	.089	.629	.113	.295	-.070	.074	.167	.070	.107	.191	.051	.010	.076	.097	-.073	.018
S60SeaFd	.256	-.011	.178	-.076	.560	.318	-.026	.110	.125	.139	.045	-.233	.137	.091	-.106	.169	-.177
S61Produ	.029	.191	.010	.033	.245	.458	.231	.453	.154	.001	-.166	.218	-.087	-.112	.096	-.005	-.120
S62FMeat	.065	.141	.098	.098	.820	-.081	.096	.090	.047	.010	.075	.102	.066	.004	.021	.054	.166

Table 8. Rotated Component Matrix for Shopping and Eating Habits

	1	2	3	4	5
H1Barga	.471	-.215	-.063	.552	-.064
H2SBran	.052	.151	-.023	.661	.299
H3SCoup	.865	.001	.008	.038	.152
H4MCoup	.868	.068	.082	-.064	.032
H5ICoup	.653	.164	.263	-.011	-.029
H6Sale	.442	-.294	.053	.318	.060
H7Rebat	.648	.317	.143	.167	-.079
H8LSizes	.208	.185	.223	.648	-.281
H9SSizes	.218	-.076	.047	-.130	.729
H10List	.200	.779	-.162	.011	.014
H11BList	-.050	.868	-.047	.049	.071
H12OStor	.587	-.047	-.059	.299	.112
H13Loyal	.547	.085	.051	.191	.154
H14Rest	.186	-.128	.637	-.274	.087
H15FFood	.066	-.112	.767	.180	-.027
H16TakO	.064	-.082	.683	.110	.309
H17RMeal	.041	.096	.268	.218	.674
H18HMeal	.262	.486	-.274	.253	-.251

Table 9. Coefficients from Satisfaction Regression with Factors as Independent Variables

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	5.753	.069		83.410	.000
Store Attributes factor 1	-.100	.079	-.120	-1.279	.203
Store Attributes factor 2	-.028	.069	-.033	-.399	.690
Store Attributes factor 3	.034	.077	.040	.437	.663
Store Attributes factor 4	.065	.072	.077	.897	.372
Store Attributes factor 5	.074	.071	.089	1.040	.300
Store Attributes factor 6	-.028	.076	-.033	-.371	.711
Store Attributes factor 7	-.034	.087	-.039	-.386	.700
Store Attributes factor 8	.042	.074	.050	.572	.569
Store Attributes factor 9	-.086	.071	-.103	-1.222	.224
Store Attributes factor 10	-.017	.077	-.020	-.221	.825
Store Attributes factor 11	-.037	.072	-.044	-.512	.609
Store Attributes factor 12	.051	.069	.061	.731	.466
Store Attributes factor 13	-.029	.071	-.034	-.405	.686
Store Attributes factor 14	.053	.070	.063	.754	.452
Store Attributes factor 15	.103	.070	.123	1.476	.143
Store Attributes factor 16	-.047	.072	-.056	-.649	.518
Store Attributes factor 17	-.006	.075	-.007	-.075	.940
Shopping/Eating Habits factor 1	-.071	.098	-.081	-.725	.470
Shopping/Eating Habits factor 2	.068	.079	.080	.862	.390
Shopping/Eating Habits factor 3	-.001	.082	-.002	-.016	.987
Shopping/Eating Habits factor 4	.206	.080	.247	2.577	.011
Shopping/Eating Habits factor 5	-.022	.093	-.024	-.235	.814

References

Arndt, J. (1979) "Family Life Cylce as a Determinant of Size and Composition of Household Expenditures," Advances in Consumer Research. Vol. 6, William Wilke, editor, pp. 128-132.

Arnold, S. J., Oum, T. H., and Tigert, D. J. (1983) "Determinant Attributes in Retail Patronage: Seasonal, Temporal, Regional, and International Comparisons," Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 20 (2), May, pp. 149-157.

Donthu, N. and Gilliland, D. (2002) "The Single Consumer," Journal of Advertising Research. Vol. 42(6), pp. 77-85.

Doyle, M. (2003) "Fighting Back with Convenience," Progressive Grocer. Vol. 82(6), April 15, pp. 20-23.

Ezell, H. & Russell, G. (1985) "Single and Multiple Person Household Shoppers: A Focus on Grocery Store Selection Criteria and Grocery Shopping Attitudes and Behavior," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science. Vol. 13(1), pp. 171-187.

Food Marketing Institute (2005) "Smaller Food Retailers' Profits Exceeded those of Larger Chains in 2003-04," Press Release, March 14, Accessed at http://www.fmi.org on May 9, 2005.

Gomez, M. I., McLaughlin, E. W., and Wittink, D. R. (2004) "Customer Satisfaction and Retail Sales Performance: A Empirical Investigation," Journal of Retailing. Vol. 80(4), pp. 265-278.

Hansen, R. A. and Deutscher, T. (1977-1978) "An Empirical Investigation of Attribute Importance in Retail Store Selection," Journal of Retailing. Vol. 53(4), Winter, pp. 59-72.

Heller, W. and McTaggart, J. (2004) "The Search for Growth," Progressive Grocer. Vol. 83(6), April 15, pp. 31-41.

Heller, W. and McTaggart, J. (2005) "Forces of Change," Progressive Grocer. Vol. 84(6), April 15, pp. 48-60.

Inman, J. & Winer, R. (1998) Where the Rubber Meets the Road: A Model of In-store Consumer Decision Making, MSI Report 98-122.. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute . October.

Joyce, M. L. and Lambert, D. R. (1996) "Memories of the Way Stores Were and Retail Store Image," International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management. Vol 24(1), pp. 24-33.

Kim, P. (1990) "Lifestages: Dramatic Changes in the American Consumer Market," Retail Control. Vol. 58(6), July/August, pp. 12-17.

Larson, R. B. (1998) "Regionality of Food Consumption," Agribusiness: An International

Journal. Vol. 14(3), May/June, pp. 213-226.

Larson, R. B. (2003) "Emerging Trends in the Food Distribution System," Journal of Food Product Marketing. Vol. 9(2), pp. 53-68.

Larson, R. B. (2004) "New Market Groupings Based on Food Consumption Patterns," Agribusiness: An International Journal. Vol. 20(4), Autumn, pp. 417-432.

Lewandowski, J. (2004) "Satisfying Single-Household Shoppers," Grocery Headquarters. Vol. 70(6), pp. 22-25.

Morrow, J. (2003) "A Place for One," American Demographics. Vol. 25(9), September, pp. 24-29.

Moses, L. (2005) "Traditional Stores' Grocery Share to Slip Below 50%, Study Shows," Supermarket News. Vol. 53(4), January 24, pp. 7, 76.

Mukherjee, A. and Hoyer, W. D. (2001) "The Effect of Novel Attributes on Product Evaluation," Journal of Consumer Research. Vol. 29(3), December, pp. 462-72.

Nelson, E. (2002) "Finger Food: Marketer Push Individual Portions and Families Bite – Single-Serving Sales Increase as Snack Packs get Bigger; Children Drive Demand – Result: 'People Eat More'," Wall Street Journal. July 23, p. A1

Noble, S. and Schewe C. (2003) "Cohort Segmentation: An Exploration of its Validity" Journal of Business Research. Vol. 56(12), December, pp.. 979-987.

Oldenburg, D. (2004) "Singled Out by Two-for-One Sales," Washington Post. July 27, p. C9.

Pressler, M. W. (2003) "Get One You Don't Want Free!" Washington Post. September 21, p. F5.

Progressive Grocer (2002) "Top of the List," Progressive Grocer Annual Report of the Grocery Industry. April pp. 27-30.

Promo. (2005) "Trip Up: Traffic Zooms for Supercenters," Vol. 18(4), March, p. 7.

Ratchford, B. T. (2003) "Has the Productivity of Retail Food Stores Really Declined?" Journal of Retailing. Vol. 79(3), Fall, pp. 171-182.

Simonson, I., Carmon, Z., and O'Curry, S. (1994) "Experimental Evidence on the Negative Effect of Product Features and Sales Promotions on Brand Choice," Marketing Science. Vol. 13(1), Winter, pp. 23-40.

Smith, J. W. and Clurman, A. (1997) Rocking the Ages. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Smith, M.. F. and Sinha, I. (2000) "The Impact of Price and Extra Product Promotions on Store Preference." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management. Vol. 28(2), March 6, pp. 83-92

SPSS Inc. (2003) SPSS Base 12.0 User's Guide. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Turcsik, R. (2004) "Grocery: Paper Trail," Progressive Grocer. Vol. 83(7), May 1, pp, 86-7

U.S. Census Bureau (2004) Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2004-2005. 124th Edition, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau

U.S. Census Bureau (1995) Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1995. 115th Edition, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau

Veiders, C. (2004) "Closing the Gaps," Supermarket News. Vol. 52, November 1, pp. 14-18, 65.

Wansink B. (1996) "Can Package Size Accelerate Usage Volume?" Journal of Marketing. Vol. 60(3), July, pp. 1-14

Wansink B., Kent, R. J., and Hoch, S. J. (1998) "An Anchoring and Adjustment Model of Purchase Quantity Decisions," Journal of Marketing Research. Vol. 35(1), February, pp. 71 -81

Wellner, A. S. (2000) "Generational Divide," American Demographics. Vol. 22(10), October, pp. 53-58.